



## ***Texas Department of Insurance***

### ***Division of Workers' Compensation***

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • [www.tdi.texas.gov](http://www.tdi.texas.gov)

## ***MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION***

### ***GENERAL INFORMATION***

#### **Requestor Name and Address**

RENAISSANCE HOSPITAL HOUSTON  
2807 LITTLE YORK ROAD  
HOUSTON TX 77093

**Carrier's Austin Representative Box**  
#19

**MFDR Date Received**  
JANUARY 8, 2007

#### **Respondent Name**

NEW HAMPSHIRE INSURANCE CO

#### **MFDR Tracking Number**

M4-07-2913-01

### ***REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY***

**Requestor's Position Summary Dated December 27, 2006:** "This bill should have been audited and reimbursed per the Stop-Loss reimbursement factor and methodology per the criteria as defined in TDI-DWC rule 134.401(c)(6)(A)...Per the stop-loss method the carrier should have reimbursed the provider \$115,871.48."

**Amount in Dispute:** \$145,004.18

### ***RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY***

**Respondent's Position Summary Dated February 12, 2007:** "The Requestor asserts it is entitled to reimbursement in the amount of \$108,753.14, which is 75% of the total charges. Requestor has not shown entitlement to this alternative, exceptional method of calculating reimbursement...To qualify for stop loss, the services provided by the hospital must be unusually costly to the hospital as opposed to unusually priced to the carrier. The services provided by the hospital (not by a physician attending a patient while in the hospital) must be unusually extensive. Exceptional cases will be entitled to reimbursement under the stop loss exception. There is no evidence submitted by the hospital demonstrating that the services provided by the hospital were unusually extensive. There is no evidence of 'complications, infections, or multiple surgeries' requiring additional services by the hospital. Secondly, there is no evidence that the services provided by the hospital were unusually costly to the hospital."

**Respondent's Supplemental Position Summary Dated August 30, 2011:** "In this case, the Respondent reimbursed Requestor for Outpatient services based upon a 'fair and reasonable' methodology previously described and reflected in its EOBs and previous timely Responses to the Requestor's Request for Medical Dispute Resolution. Requestor now presents two 'new' theories for establishing 'fair and reasonable' (1) Using the average of system-wide payments for similar services as the sole measure; (2) using the 2008 Outpatient Hospital Facility Fee Guideline...Nevertheless, Requestor's simple presentation of new theories does not provide evidence of compliance with the requirements of Labor Code §413.011...Subject to Respondent's objection to even consideration of Requestor's belated switch to an entirely new claim, from an evidentiary and statutory compliance standpoint, the TWCC, the Commissioner, MRD and SOAH have routinely rejected this simplistic, unsophisticated and unscientific methodology most recently proffered by Respondent. Requestor does not even attempt to provide any rationale, much less a compelling one, for reversing years of well-reasoned precedent. No

evidence of compliance with the eight requirements for 'fair and reasonable' is provided by Requestor. Requestor has provided non rationale to support a claim for additional reimbursement."

**Respondent's Supplemental Position Summary Dated September 12, 2011:** "Respondent submits this Respondent's Post-Appeal Supplemental Response as a response to and incorporation of the Third Court of Appeals Mandate in Cause No. 03-07-00682-CV...Based upon Respondent's initial and all supplemental responses, and in accordance with the Division's obligation to adjudicate the payment, in accordance with the Labor Code and Division rules, Requestor has failed to sustain its burden of proving entitlement to the stop-loss exception. The Division must conclude that payment should be awarded in accordance with the general *per diem* payment in accordance with 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401 (repealed)..."

**Responses Submitted by:** Flahive, Ogden & Latson

### ***SUMMARY OF FINDINGS***

Disputed Dates	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
August 23, 2006 through August 25, 2006	Inpatient Hospital Services	\$145,004.18	\$0.00

### ***FINDINGS AND DECISION***

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

#### **Background**

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to requests filed on or after January 1, 2003, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 *Texas Register* 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, 31 *Texas Register* 3561, effective May 2, 2006, sets out the guidelines for a fair and reasonable amount of reimbursement in the absence of a contract or an applicable division fee guideline.

The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

#### **Explanation of Benefits**

- 42 – Charges exceed our fee schedule or maximum allowable amount.
  - \* – Any request for reconsideration of this workers' compensation payment should be accompanied by a copy of this explanation of review. (Z658)
  - Processed and paid according to state fee schedule guidelines at a fair and reasonable rate. No additional allowance is recommended.
4. U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Michael Lynn issued a "STIPULATION AND ORDER GRANTING RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY TO PERMIT CONTINUANCE AND ADJUDICATION OF DISPUTED WORKERS COMPENSATION CLAIMS BEFORE THE TEXAS STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS," dated August 27, 2010, in the case of *In re: Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, Inc. d/b/a/ Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, et al.*, in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division in Case No. 08-43775-7. The order lifted the automatic stay to allow continuance of the claim adjudication process as to the workers' compensation receivables before SOAH, effective October 1, 2010. The order specified John Dee Spicer as the Chapter 7 trustee of the debtor's estate. By letter dated October 5, 2010, Mr. Spicer provided express written authorization for Cass Burton of the law office of Burton & Hyde, PLLC, PO Box 684749, Austin, Texas 78768-4749, to be the point of contact on Mr. Spicer's behalf relating to matters between and among the debtors and the Division concerning medical fee disputes. The Division will utilize this address in all communications with the requestor regarding this medical fee dispute.

#### **Issues**

1. Did the audited charges exceed \$40,000.00?
2. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
3. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?

4. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

**Findings**

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 Texas Register 6264. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 South Western Reporter Third 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that “to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services.” Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above was issued on January 19, 2011. Each was given the opportunity to supplement their original MDR submission, position or response as applicable. The division received supplemental information as noted in the position summaries above. The supplemental information was shared among the parties as appropriate. The documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date will be considered in determining whether the admission in dispute is eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss method of payment. Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion, the division will address whether the total audited charges ***in this case*** exceed \$40,000; whether the admission and disputed services ***in this case*** are unusually extensive; and whether the admission and disputed services ***in this case*** are unusually costly. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) states, in pertinent part, that “Independent reimbursement is allowed on a case-by-case basis if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6) of this subsection...” 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i) states “...to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed \$40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold.” Furthermore, (A) (v) of that same section states “...Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill review by the insurance carrier has been performed...” Review of the explanation of benefits issued by the carrier finds that the carrier did not deduct any charges in accordance with §134.401(c)(6)(A)(v); therefore the audited charges equal \$154,495.30 The Division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.
2. In its position statement, the requestor asserts that “This bill should have been audited and reimbursed per the Stop-Loss reimbursement factor and methodology per the criteria as defined in TDI-DWC rule 134.401(c)(6)(A).” 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) allows for payment under the stop-loss exception on a case-by-case basis only if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6). Paragraph (6)(A)(ii) states that “This stop-loss threshold is established to ensure compensation for unusually extensive services required during an admission.” The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion states that “to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services.” The requestor's position statement failed to discuss the particulars of the admission in dispute that may constitute unusually extensive services. The division concludes that the requestor failed to meet the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C).
3. In regards to whether the services were unusually costly, the requestor presumes that because the bill exceeds \$40,000, the stop loss method of payment should apply. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must **demonstrate** that an admission involved unusually costly services thereby affirming 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) which states that “Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker.” The requestor failed to demonstrate that the particulars of the admission in dispute constitutes unusually costly services; therefore, the division finds that the requestor failed to meet 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6).
4. For the reasons stated above the services in dispute are not eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement. Consequently, reimbursement shall be calculated pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount* and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements*. The Division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c)(6) of this section.

- Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part, that “The applicable Workers' Compensation Standard Per Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission...” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the length of stay for this admission was one surgical days and one ICU/CCU; therefore the standard per diem amounts of \$1,118.00 and \$1,560.00 apply respectively. The per diem rates multiplied by the allowable days result in a total allowable amount of \$2,678.00.
- 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(A), states “When medically necessary the following services indicated by revenue codes shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%: (i) Implantables (revenue codes 275, 276, and 278), and (ii) Orthotics and prosthetics (revenue code 274).” A review of the submitted medical bill indicates that the requestor billed revenue code 278 for Implants at \$110,677.63. The medical documentation provided finds that although the requestor submitted purchase orders to support what the requestor was charged by the supplier for the implantables, there was no documentation found to support the amounts that the requestor paid for the implantables. The division finds that the cost to the hospital for the implantables billed under revenue code 278 cannot be established; therefore no reimbursement can be recommended for these items.
- 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(B) allows that “When medically necessary the following services indicated by revenue codes shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate: (iv) Blood (revenue codes 380-399).” A review of the submitted hospital bill finds that the requestor billed \$3,619.05 for revenue code 382-Blood/Whole. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(D), requires the requestor to provide “documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor does not demonstrate or justify that the amount sought for revenue code 382 would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement. Additional payment cannot be recommended.
- 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(C) states “Pharmaceuticals administered during the admission and greater than \$250 charged per dose shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%. Dose is the amount of a drug or other substance to be administered at one time.” A review of the submitted itemized statement finds that the requestor billed \$287.50/unit for Thrombinar 10,000 units. The requestor did not submit documentation to support what the cost to the hospital was for these items billed under revenue code 250. For that reason, additional reimbursement for these items cannot be recommended.

The division concludes that the total allowable for this admission is \$2,678.00. The respondent paid \$9,491.12. Based upon the documentation submitted, no additional reimbursement can be recommended.

## **Conclusion**

The submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The requestor in this case demonstrated that the audited charges exceed \$40,000, but failed to demonstrate that the disputed inpatient hospital admission involved unusually extensive services, and failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually costly. Consequently, 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount*, and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements* are applied and result in no additional reimbursement.

## ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the disputed services.

### Authorized Signature

_____ Signature	_____ Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	05/29/2013 _____ Date
--------------------	---	-----------------------------

_____ Signature	_____ Health Care Business Management Director	05/29/2013 _____ Date
--------------------	---	-----------------------------

### ***YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL***

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision* together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.****

**Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.**